

## PEACE AND THE MEANS TO PEACE.

BY GILBERT REID.<sup>1</sup>

"And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils  
....."—Matt. xii. 27.

THE great Teacher, of humble origin, one of the people, refused to cast out Beelzebub by Beelzebub. He used divine power in a divine way. He would not do evil that good might come. To be righteous, as He thought it, was the best way to achieve righteousness among all generations of his fellow men. To be a Christian in these days of testing is to catch the spirit of Christ and imbue thereby the problems of the nations.

It has remained for a High-Church Anglican, the Lord Bishop of Oxford, to attest to the virtue of moral aims in waging war and effecting peace, such as President Wilson time and time again has urged on all belligerents of both sides in the world war, especially before the actual Peace Conference. Bishop Gore, on arrival in New York, used these words of spiritual clearness and dispassionate broad-mindedness: "The mere determination to beat Germany is apt to absorb all else. Whereas, in fact, we might defeat Germany and at the same time absorb so much of what is false in the spirit of the war as to defeat our professed aims in entering upon it. That is what makes me ready to do anything that lies in my power to keep the right moral principles of the war to the fore."

The Fourteen Points of President Wilson's address to Congress, January 8, of last year, have been called by some "war aims." He himself announced them as "the program of the world's peace." The major part relates to treatment to be meted out to the two Central Powers; the minor part applies to all the world. In his address on opening the Fourth Liberty Loan campaign, September 27, he dealt mainly with universal principles and to a less degree with enemy governments.

All these principles and all this program were adopted, marvelous to say, first by the spokesmen of the Central Powers, and later by the Versailles Inter-Allied Conference. Have the subsequent secret negotiations at Paris solidified or nullified these high principles, proclaimed as they were "on the housetop"?

<sup>1</sup> Director of the International Institute of China, Shanghai.

Some want to cast out Beelzebub—all wrong ideas and methods incident to the war—by righteous means and in a Christ-like spirit; others cling to fellowship with Beelzebub to crush Beelzebub, and in the crushing process to overthrow him who is innocent as well as the spirit that seeks for the highest and the best in the interrelations of nations and peoples.

What is important just now is that in the settlement of peace no aid shall be sought at the hands of Beelzebub.

Let us note a few places where Beelzebub might be able to creep in, if, indeed, he has not already crept in.

1. The natural impression went forth months ago that President Wilson and the prevailing American spirit refused, though in association with the Entente Allies, to approve everything they had done and planned since war began in 1914, but were supporting and fighting for aims which were more just,—equal opportunities to all in the future reorganization of the world. Because President Wilson seemed to occupy an advanced position as to the ultimate goal—lasting and universal peace—the enemy countries were emboldened to apply to him first of all to bring about armistice and peace. It was naturally supposed that if they could be induced to accept his program hostilities would cease without unnecessary shedding of human blood. Leading Britons had given encouragement to this supposition. Even the British Premier in July of last year stated that if “the Kaiser and his advisers are prepared to accept” the President’s conditions, “he can have peace not only with America but with Great Britain and France.”

It was not supposed that any card was “held up the sleeve.” President Wilson had himself stated as one of the conditions of peace that “diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.”

Now, how will the moral character of this new diplomacy be affected if one after another of the peace conditions be subjected to modification according to the good pleasure of just one side, or if any of the great principles be toned down or allowed to slip away? For instance, though “the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine should be righted,” as first most justly declared, the view-point of France, seconded by Great Britain and also apparently by the rest of the “Big Five,” has been that Alsace-Lorraine must be “restored to France,” in spite of the fact that this much-disputed territory has not always belonged to France and no plebiscite is to be taken.

What, then, of all other territory seized through conquest since 1871 by all the great Powers of the world on all the five continents?

The all-important point of freedom of the seas is another illustration. Naturally President Wilson's form of statement and America's original interpretation, were not acceptable to the British. The whole dispute is now relegated into annihilation by forming a League of Nations which is to allow no such thing as neutral nations, but by making all of them potentially belligerent, effectively does away with the whole problem of neutral rights. This looks like playing at diplomacy.

Will the American ideal succumb to passion or politics in harmony with one's desires? Shall the Fourteen Points be shelved while a League of Minority Nations is being formed as in a "close corporation"? Has the Beelzebub of Bias and imperial aggrandizement been given a place at the Peace Table?

2. Probably the supreme object in waging war against the Central Powers has been the overthrow of militarism. It is commonly spoken of as "Prussian," as if no other country had been dominated by militarism. The result has been that Prussia, and even every German, has been more hated than militarism. To match the force of Germany the temptation has been, quite naturally, to arrange a combination, not of mere spiritual ideas, but of superior military force, and in so doing we have weakened the strength of our arguments against militarism. For what, after all, is militarism but the will to conquer through force of arms? It is the military spirit, governing all else, on land or sea.

If it be true that the American purpose has been victory on the field of battle, it must also be acknowledged that with not a few the ultimate end has never been lost sight of, viz., lasting peace. So President Wilson in calling upon Congress to declare a state of war with the German government, said that he had "exactly the same thing in mind" that he had in mind when he previously announced his policy of mediation between the warring nations. His object still was "to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world."

But with too many the ambition has grown to have America henceforth military, to rely on war measures rather than on negotiation, to scorn peace societies and dub pacifists disloyal, and to continue to force men into army or navy by the usual method of conscription. So Bishop Gore, speaking in Boston, said: "Are we in no danger of militarism? I can conceive of no disaster comparable with this that we should win a great victory and be able to

dictate to the military autocracy of Germany a peace the most desirable that we could imagine; that we should have them under our feet, defeated before all Europe, and that then we should return to our several countries ourselves having imbibed that very disease from which we were seeking to deliver the world." He then declares that our chief moral aim "is that this is a war against war," but if we revert to the old "balances of power," "we are in view of the collapse of civilization." Shall we welcome to the Peace Table the Beelzebub of Militarism?

3. More than once has the American policy been described by President Wilson as opposed to all interference in the internal affairs of other nations, even of Germany and Austria-Hungary. To adopt such a policy of interference in any sovereign nation is contrary to the spirit of international law, and especially to the policy of the Wilson administration. In the President's address of January 8 last year he used the words: "Neither do we presume to suggest to her any alteration or modification of her institutions." At the same time he pointed out a necessary change of leadership. "But it is necessary, we must frankly say, and necessary as a preliminary to any intelligent dealings with her on our part, that we should know whom her spokesmen speak for when they speak to us, whether for the Reichstag majority or for the military party and the men whose creed is imperial domination."

In a previous address, of December 4, 1917, he also said: "We intend no wrong against the German Empire, no interference with her internal affairs." As to Austria-Hungary his tenth condition of peace originally read thus: "The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development."

But what has happened? Have not the victors openly set out to destroy the governments of the Central Powers by the Beelzebub of Revolution? Has not the orderly democratic element been handicapped by a Beelzebub of blockade and outside oppression? It has been stated by wise observers that if anarchy should spread from Russia to Germany and Austria-Hungary, it is likely to spread to Italy, France, and Great Britain, and, if there, then also to the United States. While the overthrow of autocratic rule seems desirable for the sake of democracy, is it not incumbent that we move cautiously, lest the reaction from autocracy or even monarchy be not democracy or even a republic, but anarchy and lawlessness?

Marquis Okuma is reported as saying: "Though all other



thrones in the world should totter and fall, you may be sure that the Imperial House of Japan would survive." Are we so sure? Will the anarchy resulting from antagonism to monarchical rulers and constitutional government stop with the continents of Europe and America? Might it not spread like an epidemic to Asia, and particularly to the two remaining empires of India and Japan?

4. Hatred is another Beelzebub being welcomed at the Peace Table. Perhaps we should use the milder term of lack of fairness and of conciliation.

In January of last year President Wilson said: "We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in this program that impairs it. We grudge her no achievement or distinction of learning or of pacific enterprise, such as have made her record very bright and very enviable. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power."

In his great address of September he outlined a Peace of Nations as "the most essential part of the peace settlement" of which this principle stands first: "The impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favorites and knows no standard but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned."

The Junker element in the nations opposed to the Central Powers has been crying out that the representatives of even the *people* of these two Powers should have no voice in the peace settlement, but should make complete surrender just as in the terms of armistice. How, then, can a League of *all* Nations be safely formed at the peace settlement? Are the peoples of these two nations to have no rights at all, and have no chance to defend their rights by appeal to reason? If Prussia's treatment of France in 1871 was too harsh and unjust, shall the Allied nations and the United States, aiming to organize a model world "consistent with the common interest of all," lend their influence to a peace settlement even more harsh and more unjust than that imposed by Prussia on France?

5. Another Beelzebub is the persistent violation of the spirit of international law, in the special matter of seizure or sequestration of private property of enemy subjects.

The English authority, Hall, says such action "would be looked upon with extreme disfavor." He continues: "It is evident that although it is within the bare rights of a belligerent to appropriate the property of his enemies existing within his jurisdiction, it can very rarely be wise to do so." Once again: "The absence of any instance

of confiscation in the more recent European wars, no less than the common interests of all nations and present feelings, warrant a confident hope that the dying right will never again be put in force, and that it will soon be wholly extinguished by disuse."

The lofty character of American motives in entering the war has received a shock in the rather ruthless way in which the Alien Property Custodian has disposed of property belonging to Germans. Certainly this department can do as it pleases, that is, be arbitrary, but unless such action hastens the defeat of German militarism, it seems to ordinary mortals that it would be more honorable to follow the modern trend of international law.

Right at the time that both Central Powers made overtures for peace and the armies of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, and the United States were assured of victory, the announcement was made that the Alien Property Custodian was taking "control of property valued at more than \$21,300,000 which had previously been owned by, or held in trust for, descendants of wealthy American families, most of whom are now in possession of German and Austrian titles."

Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, speaking in Philadelphia, lately gave his view-point: "Germany must be made to understand that her plan has failed in the industrial field as in the military. Industrial disarmament must come along with military disarmament," i. e., for Germany, but for no other country.

Again, while men everywhere were talking peace, the Allied Ministers in Peking, six of them, complained to the Chinese Government because it had delayed, as it had the right to delay, in interning German subjects in China and in breaking up German business houses, an object that not a few Britons had had in mind from the autumn of 1914.

All this, moreover, is contrary to the lofty principle stated by President Wilson in his speech of last September. He said: "Special alliances and economic rivalries and hostilities have been the prolific source in the modern world of the plans and passions that produce war. It would be an insincere as well as an insecure peace that did not exclude them in definite and binding terms."

It looks as if to the high-handedness of ruining private individuals of a belligerent nation, the victors would now form a league to carry forward the baneful policy of economic rivalry. Better the appeal of Lord Robert Cecil: "Let us erect the superstructure of a new international order, which will substitute international cooperation for international competition."

6. This war, at least American participation therein, is to liberate weak nations, oppressed peoples, and persecuted individuals. The essential idea of democracy is human freedom.

President Wilson in the fourth of his five principles for world-wide application—a modern Sermon on the Mount—asks: “Shall there be a common standard of right and privilege for all peoples and nations or shall the strong do as they will and the weak suffer without redress?”

This liberation primarily is for the Balkan peoples, for the peoples of Russia, for those under Turkish rule and in the once Empire-Kingdom of Austria-Hungary, and even for the people of the German States. May it not be applied to the diverse races and peoples dwelling within the bounds of these United States and of all our possessions?

Will it not soon be clear that oppressive methods have been used far too much on conscientious American citizens and on those who have fled from European tyranny to “the land of the free and the home of the brave”? Has the conscientious objector fared as well under the Stars and Stripes as under the Union Jack? Has the American opposed to war or to the entrance of his own country into the war, received as considerate treatment as men of similar mind have been accorded in the United Kingdom, to say nothing of Ireland? Has criticism of the Administration at Washington or of any American officials been tolerated to the same degree as criticism of the British Government and Lloyd George or even criticism of the German Imperial Government, and of the Kaiser himself? Is it not dangerous for every insignificant man to express his own thoughts, especially when his thoughts are erroneous in the eyes of the majority, or when he expresses himself in broken English? In a word, has not our great country lost much in not holding to the fundamental principles embodied in our Constitution and shown forth in the proud record of American institutions, liberal and just?

We wanted to overthrow European autocracy; has any American been autocratic? Has the Beelzebub of Autocracy been given a seat among the Big Five?

We lament the harshness of the Brest-Litovsk treaty; will we countenance something more harsh in heaping retribution on Germany and Austria-Hungary?

We point the finger of scorn at the oppressive domination of German military rule; has any American tasted oppression since Good Friday, 1917?

We feel sorry that so many in Europe are not free; are all Americans free?

We used to trace lawlessness and riots in Central and Eastern Europe to arbitrary officialdom; to what must we trace lawless and riotous conduct in this country?

Shall we make use of methods which we condemn in others?

St. Paul itemized the sins of the Gentiles, but, lest the Jews be puffed up with vain glory, he asked: "Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonorest thou God?"

## ANDREW D. WHITE—NEUTRAL.

BY ROLAND HUGINS.

THE duration of the world war coincided with the last years of Andrew Dickson White. He died on November 4, 1918. If he had lived three days more he would have come to his eighty-sixth birthday. If he had been granted seven days more he would have lived until the signing of the armistice with Germany. So the final span of this great American's life overlapped almost exactly the period during which was fought the greatest battle of history.

Naturally Dr. White was intensely interested in the great conflict. The attention of practically every one in the world was absorbed by it. But not only that: he had an especial reason for interest, because of the fact that he knew personally many of the diplomats and generals who were responsible for the breaking of the flood-gates, and understood the inside diplomatic history of Europe during the last generation. He had served as Minister to Germany and to Russia, and later again as Ambassador to Germany. After his retirement in his seventieth year, he came to live in his spacious residence on the Cornell Campus. There he kept open house for members of the faculty and undergraduates. Those who came into contact with Dr. White in this period knew how stimulating and elevating was his influence. He brought something of Olympus to Ithaca.

In the summer of 1915 a little book of mine appeared under the title *Germany Misjudged*, printed by the Open Court Publishing Company. It was scarcely more than a lengthy pamphlet. It contended that America should keep out of the world war. Although tinged with a mild pro-Germanism, it was really pacifist in tone and intent, and might just as well have been entitled "The Duty of